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Background

• Rapid globalization and ever-increasing demand for freight movements
• Emission problems from freight transportation
  – Most freight transportation modes are powered by diesel engines
  – Significant sources of national air pollutants (e.g., NO\textsubscript{x}, PM) and greenhouse gases (e.g., CO\textsubscript{2}) (ICF Consulting, 2005)

• Emissions from freight transportation activities
  – Climate change (on global scale)
  – Air quality and human health (in regional and urban areas)
• Freight delivery systems need to be thoroughly investigated to understand their impacts on environment
Emission projections today

**Input-output model**

- Economy-wide model
- Separate economic sectors
- Apply emission coefficient to activity in each sector
  
  (+): *response to economic environment*, e.g. fuel switching
  
  (-): Little “How-to”–engineering component

**Technology & infrastructure model**

- Situation-specific
- Data intensive, requiring fleet composition, traffic links, etc.
- Emissions from specific conditions & vehicle types
  
  (+): *Realistic emissions that can be connected to policy decisions*
  
  (-): Difficult to extrapolate to other situations

**Hybrid model**

- Activity and growth driven by input-output model
- Linked to technology choice using general theoretical principles
- Models (e.g. emission rates) constrained by observations whenever possible

...and tomorrow
Inter-regional freight

Global Economic Forecasts

Future Economic Scenarios

Employment, Population; Commodity Origin & Destination

Inter-regional Freight Flow

CO2 & Pollutants Emission Projections

Phoenix Model

Shift share & Input-Output Model

Freight Commodity Transportation Forecasting Model

SPEWtrend Model

For heavy-duty trucks and rail
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B. Lee, S. Lee, Urban Planning
Y. Ouyang, T. Hwang, Transportation (CEE)
T. Bond, L. Liu, F. Yan, Air Quality (CEE)
Intra-regional freight

Global Economic Forecasts

Urban Spatial Structure

Freight Transportation System

Air Quality and Emission

Future Economic Scenarios

Urban development scenarios (compact/polycentric/BAU)

Delivery activity

CO2 & Pollutants Emission Projections

Phoenix Model

Spatial autoregression model

Ring-sweep algorithm

SPEWTrend Model

For medium duty trucks; not presented here

S. Smith, PNNL
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Y. Ouyang, T. Hwang, Transportation (CEE)
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Framework

Freight demand and logistics modeling:
Develop and integrate a set of U.S. freight transportation system models to capture interdependencies on future economic growth and urban spatial structure changes

Scope
(i) Inter-regional freight flow; e.g., from Los Angeles to Chicago
(ii) Intra-regional freight flow; e.g., within Chicago metropolitan area
(iii) Point-to-point delivery routing
Inter-regional Freight Demand

Four-step freight commodity transportation demand forecasting model (NCHRP Report 606, 2008)

Economic growth factor forecast for each geographical region

- **Trip Generation**
  Entering and exiting freight demand (attractions and productions) by zone

- **Trip Distribution**
  Zonal O/D freight demand

- **Mode Split**
  Zonal O/D freight demand by shipping mode

- **Traffic Assignment**
  Traffic flow, average speed on each link

123 domestic Freight Analysis Zone (FAZ)
Introduction

- **Objective**
  Forecast future freight demand that begins and ends in each FAZ, and distribute them on all O/D pairs

- **Methodology: RAS algorithm (Stone, 1961; Stone and Brown, 1962)**
  **Basic Ideas**
  - Forecast of economic growth factors are given for all FAZs
  - Current FAZ structure does not change (i.e., neither new zone will appear nor currently existing zone will disappear)
  - Distribution of future freight demand is proportional to that of base-year demand
Freight Demand Generation/Distribution

For commodity type $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$,

- $O = \text{origin zone set, } \{1, 2, \ldots, Z\}$
- $D = \text{destination zone set, } \{1, 2, \ldots, Z\}$
- $P^i_o = \text{base-year total production of commodity } i \text{ in an origin zone } o$
- $A^i_d = \text{base-year total attraction of commodity } i \text{ in a destination zone } d$
- $\alpha^i_{o} = \text{growth rate of commodity } i \text{ production in an origin zone } o \text{ for future year } y$
- $\beta^i_{d} = \text{growth rate of commodity } i \text{ attraction in a destination zone } d \text{ for future year } y$
- $D^i_{od} = \text{freight volume of commodity } i \text{ moving from origin zone } o \text{ to destination zone } d$
### Freight Demand Generation/Distribution

**Step 0.** Generate base-year freight demand O/D matrix for commodity $i$:

Let $D_{od}^i$ be base-year commodity $i$ freight movement from origin $o$ to destination $d$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>..</th>
<th>$d$</th>
<th>..</th>
<th>$Z$</th>
<th>Given Production</th>
<th>Future Production</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$o$</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>$D_{od}^i$</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>$P_o^i$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Z$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given Attraction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$A_o^i$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Attraction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$W_d^i$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Step 1.** Estimate future production and future attraction for all FAZs:

- Multiply each $P_o^i$, $A_o^i$, $A_d^i$ by $\beta_d^{i,y}$.
- Define $V_o^i = \alpha_o^{i,y} P_o^i W_d^i$ and $\beta_d^{i,y}$, $\forall o \in O, d \in D$.

![Diagram of freight demand generation/distribution](image-url)
Freight Demand Generation/Distribution

Step 2. Since future input and output commodity growth are modeled separately,

Total future production summed across all origin zones
\[
\left( \sum_{\forall o \in O} V_o^i \right)
\]

Total future attraction summed across all destination zones
\[
\left( \sum_{\forall d \in D} W_d^i \right)
\]

- Assume freight commodity productions are derived by attractions
- Multiply future productions of all origin zones by the same factor:

\[
V_o^i \leftarrow V_o^i \left( \frac{\sum_{\forall d \in D} W_d^i}{\sum_{\forall o \in O} V_o^i} \right), \forall o \in O.
\]

- Then, \[\sum_{\forall o \in O} V_o^i = \sum_{\forall d \in D} W_d^i\]
Freight Demand
Generation/Distribution

Step 3. Apply RAS algorithm:
Modify each entry \( (D^i_{od}) \) iteratively to match with the future production in each row and the future attraction in each column.

Define tolerance \( \varepsilon \), and let \( L = \) large positive integer and \( n = 1 \).

Define \( R^i_o = \frac{V^i_o}{\sum_{d \in D} D^i_{od}}, \forall o \in O, \) and \( C^i_d = \frac{W^i_d}{\sum_{o \in O} D^i_{od}}, \forall d \in D. \)

While \( \{(n \leq L) \) and \( (|R^i_o - 1| > \varepsilon \) for some \( o \in O \) or \( |C^i_d - 1| > \varepsilon \) for some \( d \in D) \)}

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Set } D^i_{od} &\leftarrow R^i_o D^i_{od}, \forall o \in O, d \in D, \\
\text{Update } C^i_d &\leftarrow \frac{W^i_d}{\sum_{o \in O} D^i_{od}}, \forall d \in D, \\
\text{Set } D^i_{od} &\leftarrow C^i_d D^i_{od}, \forall o \in O, d \in D, \\
\text{Update } R^i_o &\leftarrow \frac{V^i_o}{\sum_{d \in D} D^i_{od}}, \forall o \in O, \\
\text{Update } n &\leftarrow n + 1.
\end{align*}
\]
Freight Transportation
Mode Choice

- Goal
  Draw connections among various economic and engineering factors, freight transportation modal choice, and subsequently freight transportation emissions

  - Significant difference in emissions across modes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>CO₂ Emission Factor (kgCO₂/ton-mile)</th>
<th>CH₄ Emission Factor (gCH₄/ton-mile)</th>
<th>N₂O Emission Factor (gN₂O/ton-mile)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On-Road Truck</td>
<td>0.2970</td>
<td>0.0035</td>
<td>0.0027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail</td>
<td>0.0252</td>
<td>0.0020</td>
<td>0.0006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterborne Craft</td>
<td>0.0480</td>
<td>0.0041</td>
<td>0.0014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft</td>
<td>1.5270</td>
<td>0.0417</td>
<td>0.0479</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: EPA (2008)

Freight Transportation
Mode Choice

• Focus on two dominating freight modes: Truck and Rail
• Macroscopic binomial logit market share model for mode choice
  o Dependent variable: Annual market % share of shipments between modes (between 0 and 1)
  o Explanatory variables for each commodity type:
    Commodity value per ton ($/ton): $VALUE$
    Avg. shipment distance for truck (mile): $DIST_T$
    Avg. shipment distance for rail (mile): $DIST_R$
    Crude oil price ($/barrel): $OILPRC$
  o Data: Observed modal split for each O/D pair
Mode Choice: 
Binomial Logit Market Share Model

Utility of truck for commodity $n$: $U_T^n = a_{1n} + b_{1n} \cdot VALUE + c_{1n} \cdot DIST_T + d_{1n} \cdot OILPRC,$

Utility of rail for commodity $n$: $U_R^n = a_{2n} + b_{2n} \cdot VALUE + c_{2n} \cdot DIST_R + d_{2n} \cdot OILPRC,$

Market share of truck for commodity $n$: $P_T^n = \frac{e^{U_T^n}}{e^{U_T^n} + e^{U_R^n}} = \frac{e^{U_T^n - U_R^n}}{e^{U_T^n - U_R^n} + 1},$

Market share of rail for commodity $n$: $P_R^n = \frac{e^{U_R^n}}{e^{U_T^n} + e^{U_R^n}} = \frac{1}{e^{U_T^n - U_R^n} + 1},$

\[
\ln \left( \frac{P_T^n}{1 - P_T^n} \right) = U_T^n - U_R^n = (a_{1n} - a_{2n}) + (b_{1n} - b_{2n}) \cdot VALUE + (c_{1n}) \cdot DIST_T + (-c_{2n}) \cdot DIST_R + (d_{1n} - d_{2n}) \cdot OILPRC.
\]

- Generalized linear form with four explanatory variables
- Intercept and coefficients estimated via linear regression
Data Sources and Processing

• Freight Transportation Data
  – Freight Analysis Framework (FAF) database from the U.S. DOT
    Datasets Version 2 (FAF²) for year 2002 and version 3 (FAF³) for year 2007
  – Commodity Flow Survey (CFS) data from the U.S. Census Bureau
    Freight transportation activities in years 1993 and 1997
    Average shipment distances of truck and rail
  – West Texas Intermediate (WTI) crude oil price from Economagic.com
    o Merged into one useable database (69,477 observations)

• Divide the database into two sets for each commodity type
  i. **Training set** for estimation: 2/3 of the total observations
  ii. **Test set** for validation: 1/3 of the total observations

• Statistical software package, R (version 2.12.1)
## Estimation Results and Goodness of Fit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Type 1</th>
<th>Type 2</th>
<th>Type 3</th>
<th>Type 4</th>
<th>Type 5</th>
<th>Type 6</th>
<th>Type 7</th>
<th>Type 8</th>
<th>Type 9</th>
<th>Type 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intercept</strong></td>
<td>1.989E+00</td>
<td>1.777E+00</td>
<td>3.800E+00</td>
<td>9.383E-01</td>
<td>1.390E+00</td>
<td>2.954E+00</td>
<td>3.014E+00</td>
<td>1.910E+00</td>
<td>1.702E+00</td>
<td>9.978E-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>z-statistic</strong></td>
<td>12761.00</td>
<td>5868.29</td>
<td>28335.00</td>
<td>10357.00</td>
<td>8350.80</td>
<td>15685.00</td>
<td>21139.20</td>
<td>4176.90</td>
<td>5472.90</td>
<td>811.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Pr(&gt;</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>)**</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value per ton</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimate</strong></td>
<td>2.428E-03</td>
<td>2.096E-03</td>
<td>1.059E-03</td>
<td>6.210E-04</td>
<td>6.130E-04</td>
<td>4.850E-04</td>
<td>1.113E-04</td>
<td>7.085E-04</td>
<td>4.311E-03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>z-statistic</strong></td>
<td>8593.00</td>
<td>7124.43</td>
<td>1211.00</td>
<td>7289.40</td>
<td>5238.40</td>
<td>4593.40</td>
<td>1948.40</td>
<td>3655.00</td>
<td>1545.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Pr(&gt;</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>)**</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Avg. truck distance</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimate</strong></td>
<td>-1.532E-03</td>
<td>-1.766E-03</td>
<td>-1.190E-03</td>
<td>-1.663E-03</td>
<td>-1.531E-03</td>
<td>1.904E-04</td>
<td>-3.142E-03</td>
<td>-4.025E-03</td>
<td>-1.901E-03</td>
<td>-2.042E-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>z-statistic</strong></td>
<td>-2796.00</td>
<td>-1680.74</td>
<td>-2488.00</td>
<td>-3390.00</td>
<td>-2418.20</td>
<td>252.00</td>
<td>-3714.60</td>
<td>2113.00</td>
<td>-1792.30</td>
<td>-472.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Pr(&gt;</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>)**</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Avg. rail distance</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimate</strong></td>
<td>-1.123E-03</td>
<td>-1.960E-03</td>
<td>-2.155E-03</td>
<td>2.780E-04</td>
<td>-2.026E-03</td>
<td>1.225E-03</td>
<td>2.580E-03</td>
<td>2.232E-04</td>
<td>-1.599E-03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>z-statistic</strong></td>
<td>-2258.00</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>-4958.00</td>
<td>-5019.00</td>
<td>485.40</td>
<td>-2912.50</td>
<td>1613.70</td>
<td>1494.90</td>
<td>-234.50</td>
<td>-138.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Pr(&gt;</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>)**</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WTI crude oil price</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimate</strong></td>
<td>4.579E-03</td>
<td>-4.808E-03</td>
<td>-1.383E-02</td>
<td>-2.901E-02</td>
<td>-7.312E-03</td>
<td>-3.134E-03</td>
<td>1.011E-02</td>
<td>2.285E-02</td>
<td>3.305E-02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>z-statistic</strong></td>
<td>1634.00</td>
<td>-965.59</td>
<td>-5993.00</td>
<td>-14669.00</td>
<td>-2758.90</td>
<td>-818.30</td>
<td>-389.90</td>
<td>963.90</td>
<td>4948.40</td>
<td>432.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Pr(&gt;</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>)**</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of data used</th>
<th>3,802</th>
<th>5,468</th>
<th>3,753</th>
<th>3,105</th>
<th>5,883</th>
<th>6,068</th>
<th>6,035</th>
<th>5,100</th>
<th>2,062</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pseudo McFadden</strong></td>
<td>McFadden</td>
<td>0.348</td>
<td>0.427</td>
<td>0.241</td>
<td>0.659</td>
<td>0.270</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>0.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R-squared</strong></td>
<td>Nagelkerke</td>
<td>0.391</td>
<td>0.456</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td>0.747</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>0.410</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>0.143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Estimation Results and Goodness of Fit

• All estimates are statistically significant (all $p$-values $\leq 0.001$)

• Interpretations and insights
  – Positive Intercept: Everything else being equal, truck is more likely to be chosen
  – Positive “Value per ton”: Truck tends to ship higher value goods than rail
  – Negative “Avg. truck distance”: As shipping distance increases, utility of truck decreases
  – Negative “Avg. rail distance”: As shipping distance increases, rail is preferred
  – Negative “WTI crude oil price”: As oil price increases, rail is preferred
Traffic Assignment

- Goal: Assign freight traffic onto modal networks for all shipment O/D pairs

- Route choice rule: User equilibrium (Wardrope, 1959; Sheffi, 1985)
  - Each motorist selects the shortest travel time route between O/D
  - All used routes connecting each O/D pair have the same cost/travel time which is less than or equal to the costs of unused routes

- Algorithm
  1. Convex combinations algorithm (Frank and Wolfe, 1956, coded in VC++)
  2. Input: graph representation of modal networks, demand for all O/D pairs
  3. Output file: assigned traffic flow, average speed on each link, link cost, etc.
Truck Traffic Assignment

• Model development
  – Standard network assignment problem under user equilibrium principle (Sheffi, 1985)
  – Bureau of Public Roads (BPR) link cost function (Bureau of Public Roads, 1970) modified to include background traffic volume

• Data for graph representation of freight truck network
  1) O/D nodes: 120 centroids of FAF³ regions boundary
     – Exclude Hawaii (2 zones) and Alaska (1 zone)
  2) U.S. road network: FAF³ network
     – Consider only major interstate highways
     – Background traffic (AADT) and link capacity in Year 2007

• Data for truck freight demand
  FAF³ truck shipment database (FHWA U.S. DOT, 2011)
     – Real truck freight demand data (in tonnage) in Year 2007
Truck Traffic Assignment: Data (2)

- Simplified U.S. major highway freight truck road network

1) 178 nodes
   - Centroids of domestic FAZs (120 nodes)
   - Major junctions in the interstate highway network (58 nodes)

2) 14,400 O/D pairs
   - Each centroid of 120 FAF³ zones is both origin and destination of freight demand

3) 588 links
   - Mostly major interstate highways
   - Some local roads: for FAF³ centroids located far from the major interstate highway network
Truck Traffic Assignment: Data (3)

- Parameters
  - Average truckload (tons per truck) = 16 (FHWA U.S. DOT, 2007; EPA and NHTSA, 2011)
  - Passenger-car equivalents (assuming rolling terrain) = 2.5 (HCM, 2000)
  - Hours of operation of the freight truck delivery system = 24×365
  - Truck free flow speed (mph) = 65 (Bai et al., 2011)
  - Background traffic = AADT/(2×24)
  - BPR link cost function modified to include background traffic volume

\[ t(\omega) = t_f \left[ 1 + \alpha \left( \frac{\omega + b}{C} \right)^\beta \right] \]

where \( t_f \) = link free flow travel time (hr), \( \omega \) = assigned traffic volume (#of veh/hr), \( b \) = background traffic volume (#of veh/hr), \( C \) = link capacity (#of veh/hr), \( \alpha = 0.15 \), and \( \beta = 4 \)
Truck Traffic Assignment Results

- Total Cost = \( \sum (\text{Link Travel Time} \times \text{Assigned Link Flow}) = \sum_{a \in A} t_a (x_a) x_a = 699,827.88 \) (veh-hr/hour)
- Convergence is reached within a tolerance of 0.0001% after 12 iterations (0.640 sec CPU time)
- Output: link and node number, link distance, total and assigned traffic volume, link cost (link travel time), average link speed at equilibrium

* Unit of assigned flow: # of vehicles (passenger cars) per hour
Model Validation

- Freight traffic distribution (annual tonnage) on the U.S. highway (red), rail (brown), and inland waterways (blue) networks in Year 2007 (FHWA U.S. DOT, 2011)
Model Validation

- Truck traffic distribution on the U.S. highway network

Trend consistent in a high level:
Washington, Oregon, California, Florida, the Midwest states near Chicago, and northeastern regions

Less emphasized in our result:
Some main highway links that connect Southern California, Arizona, and Oklahoma
Rail Traffic Assignment

- Rail network operates very differently from highway network
  - Link traffic flow in opposite directions shares the same track infrastructure
  - Assign bi-directional traffic flow on one shared undirected link (i.e., undirected graph)
- Railroad-specific link cost function (Krueger 1999; Lai and Barkan, 2009)
  - For undirected railroad link \( e \in E \)
    \[
    t_e(\omega_e) = T_e + \frac{\alpha_e d_e}{100} e^{\beta_e \omega_e}, \forall e \in E,
    \]
  where,
  - \( T_e \) = link free flow travel time (hour)
  - \( d_e \) = link length (mile)
  - \( \omega_e \) = the total rail link flow (# of trains/day)
  - \( \alpha_e, \beta_e \) = parameters uniquely determined by rail operating conditions

Rail Traffic Assignment: Methodology

• Equivalent directed graph representation of the undirected rail network
  Each undirected link is replaced by two separate directed links in opposite directions

  \[
  x_{ij} \quad x_{ji}
  \]

• Railroad link cost function for the directed graph

  \[
  t_{ij} \left( x_{ij} + x_{ji} \right) = T_{ij} + \frac{\alpha_{ij} d_{ij}}{100} e^{\beta_{ij} (x_{ij} + x_{ji})}, \forall (i, j) \in A
  \]

  Link travel times on both directed links (from node \(i\) to \(j\) and from node \(j\) to \(i\)) are identical

• Modify conventional convex combinations algorithm
  - Consider traffic volume in both directions whenever link cost is updated

  \[
  x_{ij} (x_{ij} + x_{ji})
  \]
Rail Traffic Assignment: Data (1)

• Data for graph representation of rail network
  1) O/D nodes: 120 centroids of FAF\(^3\) regions boundary
     – Exclude Hawaii (2 zones) and Alaska (1 zone)
  2) U.S. rail network: Rail network GIS data (ATLAS, 2011)
     – Select rail network main lines on which Class I railroads (AMTK, BNSF, CSXT, KCS, NS, UP, CN, CP in the database) operate
     – Incorporated double track information obtained from Richards and Cobb (2010)

• Data for rail freight demand
  – Converted the freight shipment demand in tonnage into equivalent numbers of trainloads based on the types of commodities (AAR, 2007; Cambridge Systematics, Inc., 2007)

• Parameters: operation days per year = 365; free flow speed (mph) = 60 (Krueger, 1999)
Railroad Traffic Assignment: Data (2)

- Simplified U.S. rail network

1) 183 nodes
   - Centroids of domestic FAZs (120 nodes)
   - Major intersections in the selected rail network (63 nodes)

2) 40,909 O/D pairs
   - Consider both shipment O/D pairs and commodity types

3) 566 links
   - Mostly major railroad tracks on which Class I railroads operate
   - Some tracks on which other minor railroads operate: for FAF$^3$ centroids located far from the major rail network
**Railroad Traffic Assignment: User Equilibrium Results**

- Total Cost = \( \sum_{(i,j) \in A} t_{ij} (x_{ij} + x_{ji}) x_{ij} = 75,426 \) (train-hr/day)
- Convergence is reached within a tolerance of 0.001% after 2,569 iterations (25.559 sec CPU time)
- Output: link number, link origin and destination node, link distance, freight shipment volume (for each commodity type), link cost (link travel time), average link speed

*Unit of assigned flow: 
\# of trains per day"
Model Validation

- Rail traffic distribution on the U.S. rail network

Trend consistent at a high level:
Washington, California, Wyoming, Montana, the Midwest states near Chicago, northeastern regions, and some main links that connect Southern California, Texas, and Kansas

More emphasized in our result:
Idaho, Oregon, and southeastern regions
Software Development

- Integrated decision-support software for four-step inter-regional freight demand forecasting
- Visual Basic Applications (VBA) in Microsoft Excel platform

Overview of the software

Input

Main Program

Output

Included in one Excel file
Software Development

- Procedure of the program

```
Input -> Main Program -> Output
```

### Four-step Inter-regional Freight Commodity Transportation Demand Forecasting Model

- **Input:**
  - Future Year: 2010
  - Economic Growth and Environmental Policy Scenario: High Business as usual

- **Output:**
  - Uncheck if individual step needs to be run
  - Entire Model
  - Trip Generation
  - Trip Distribution
  - Modal Split
  - Network Assignment

*Note: This software will periodically provide an opportunity to abort the program. No response is needed if you want to keep the program running.*
Software Development

- Input worksheets
  - Each step in the four-step analysis requires different input worksheets to conduct the analysis
  - Total eighteen different input worksheets
    - Trip generation and Trip distribution
      - “Attraction_S1”, “Attraction_S2”, “Attraction_S3”, “Attraction_S4”, “Production_S1”, “Production_S2”, “Production_S3”, “Production_S4”, and “2007Demand”
    - Modal split
      - “TruckDist”, “RailDist”, and “ModalSplit”
    - Network assignment
Software Development

- Procedure of the program

Input

Main Program

Output

- Output worksheets
  Results from different steps will be recorded in seven different output worksheets
  - Trip generation
    “Trip_Generation”
  - Trip distribution
    “Trip_Distribution”
  - Modal split
    “Modal_Split”
  - Truck freight demand network assignment
    “TruckResult” and “TruckMap”
  - Rail freight demand network assignment
    “RailResult” and “RailMap”
Software Development

Visualization of the final results

“TruckMap” worksheet

“RailMap” worksheet

- Help decision-makers explore atmospheric impacts of future freight shipment activities in various economic scenarios
Illustrative Examples of Model Application

Sample Questions:

• How would economic growth affect inter-regional freight transportation?

• How would fuel price affect freight modal choice?

• How could congestion in current transportation infrastructure restrict freight movements, and what are the impacts of capacity investments?
Future Freight Demand Forecast

• Forecast future freight demand distribution within the U.S. from 2010 to 2050 in five-year increments

• Four scenarios
  – Scenario 1 (S1): High GDP growth & Business as usual
  – Scenario 2 (S2): High GDP growth & Climate policy
  – Scenario 3 (S3): Low GDP growth & Business as usual
  – Scenario 4 (S4): Low GDP growth & Climate policy

• Data
  1. Base-year freight demand distribution matrix:
     Freight Analysis Framework data version 3 (FAF³) for Year 2007
        Origin, Destination, Commodity type, Freight demand (in tonnage)
  2. Future I/O commodity value growth estimates for all scenarios:
     Exogenously given from the input-out model (2005-2050 in five-year increments)
Future Freight Demand Forecast

- Freight demand forecasting results
  - Algorithm converged in a short time
  - Future freight demand is generated (360, 120-by-120 matrices)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Scenario 1: High GDP growth with business as usual</th>
<th>Scenario 2: High GDP growth with climate policy</th>
<th>Scenario 3: Low GDP growth with business as usual</th>
<th>Scenario 4: Low GDP growth with climate policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scenario 1: Total freight demand forecasted (thousand ton)</td>
<td>Scenario 2: Total freight demand forecasted (thousand ton)</td>
<td>Scenario 3: Total freight demand forecasted (thousand ton)</td>
<td>Scenario 4: Total freight demand forecasted (thousand ton)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(g) % change</td>
<td>(h) % change</td>
<td>(i) % change</td>
<td>(j) % change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>15,059,745</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>15,059,745</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>15,703,789</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>15,648,288</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>17,501,995</td>
<td>16.22</td>
<td>17,438,001</td>
<td>15.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>19,431,308</td>
<td>29.03</td>
<td>18,780,540</td>
<td>24.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>21,438,103</td>
<td>42.35</td>
<td>20,650,764</td>
<td>37.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>23,693,953</td>
<td>57.33</td>
<td>22,780,286</td>
<td>51.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>26,034,285</td>
<td>72.87</td>
<td>24,945,108</td>
<td>65.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>28,697,929</td>
<td>90.56</td>
<td>27,356,813</td>
<td>81.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2045</td>
<td>31,574,234</td>
<td>109.66</td>
<td>29,893,810</td>
<td>98.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050</td>
<td>34,673,664</td>
<td>130.24</td>
<td>32,621,827</td>
<td>116.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Suitable for long-term economic forecasts
  Global economic forecasts models: hard to capture unexpected short-term economic fluctuations (e.g., recession in 2007-2009)
Modal Application - Emission Estimation

- Modal split and the following emission estimations for a range of WTI crude oil price
  - Select one arbitrary data record: Commodity type 5 (basic chemicals, chemical and pharmaceutical products) from Texas to Colorado

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freight value per unit weight</th>
<th>Avg. truck distance</th>
<th>Avg. rail distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,240.85/ton</td>
<td>1,005 miles</td>
<td>1,332 miles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total annual freight shipment demand in data = 328,000 ton

- Forecast annual freight shipment split for different oil price range
- Estimate total emission and greenhouse gas inventory


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CO\textsubscript{2} emission factor (kgCO\textsubscript{2}/ton-mile)</th>
<th>CH\textsubscript{4} emission factor (gCH\textsubscript{4}/ton-mile)</th>
<th>N\textsubscript{2}O emission factor (gN\textsubscript{2}O/ton-mile)</th>
<th>PM\textsubscript{10} emission factor (gPM\textsubscript{10}/ton-mile)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Truck</td>
<td>0.2970</td>
<td>0.0035</td>
<td>0.0027</td>
<td>0.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail</td>
<td>0.0252</td>
<td>0.0020</td>
<td>0.0006</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Model Application - Emission Estimation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WTI crude oil price ($/barrel)</th>
<th>(a) Truck share prediction (%)</th>
<th>(b) Rail share prediction (%)</th>
<th>(c) Truck CO₂ emission (ton)</th>
<th>(d) Rail CO₂ emission (ton)</th>
<th>(e) Total CO₂ emission (ton)</th>
<th>(f) Truck CH₄ emission (kg)</th>
<th>(g) Rail CH₄ emission (kg)</th>
<th>(h) Total CH₄ emission (kg)</th>
<th>(i) Truck N₂O emission (kg)</th>
<th>(j) Rail N₂O emission (kg)</th>
<th>(k) Total N₂O emission (kg)</th>
<th>(l) Truck PM₁₀ emission (kg)</th>
<th>(m) Rail PM₁₀ emission (kg)</th>
<th>(n) Total PM₁₀ emission (kg)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>66.8%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>65,412</td>
<td>3,654</td>
<td>69,066</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>1,061</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>20,262</td>
<td>1,885</td>
<td>22,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>62,163</td>
<td>4,019</td>
<td>66,182</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>19,256</td>
<td>2,073</td>
<td>21,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>58,784</td>
<td>4,399</td>
<td>63,183</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>1,042</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>18,209</td>
<td>2,269</td>
<td>20,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>55,304</td>
<td>4,791</td>
<td>60,094</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>1,032</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>17,131</td>
<td>2,471</td>
<td>19,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>51,758</td>
<td>5,189</td>
<td>56,947</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>1,022</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>16,033</td>
<td>2,677</td>
<td>18,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>48,181</td>
<td>5,591</td>
<td>53,773</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>1,012</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>14,925</td>
<td>2,885</td>
<td>17,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>44,613</td>
<td>5,993</td>
<td>50,606</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>1,001</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>13,820</td>
<td>3,091</td>
<td>16,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>41,091</td>
<td>6,389</td>
<td>47,480</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>12,729</td>
<td>3,296</td>
<td>16,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>37,651</td>
<td>6,776</td>
<td>44,426</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>11,663</td>
<td>3,495</td>
<td>15,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>34,324</td>
<td>7,150</td>
<td>41,474</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>10,632</td>
<td>3,688</td>
<td>14,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
<td>31,140</td>
<td>7,508</td>
<td>38,648</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>9,646</td>
<td>3,873</td>
<td>13,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
<td>28,120</td>
<td>7,848</td>
<td>35,968</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>8,711</td>
<td>4,048</td>
<td>12,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>25,282</td>
<td>8,167</td>
<td>33,449</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>7,832</td>
<td>4,213</td>
<td>12,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>22,638</td>
<td>8,464</td>
<td>31,102</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>7,012</td>
<td>4,366</td>
<td>11,379</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- National emission estimation
  Aggregate emission calculations across all shipment O/D pairs and all commodity types
Rail Network Capacity Expansion and Its Effect on Network Assignment

- Rail freight demand: projected to increase 88% by Year 2035
  - Sever congestion is expected (Cambridge Systematics, Inc., 2007)
  - Infrastructure investment may be needed near potential chokepoints
    → Will affect future rail freight demand assignment patterns

- “Before and After” comparison for Year 2035
  - Action: on the most congested railroad links in 2035
    → Average link speed ≤ 10 mph
  - Single tracks will be expanded to full double tracks
Rail Network Capacity Expansion and Its Effect on Network Assignment

- Congestion prediction in Year 2035 without infrastructure investment

Our model

Cambridge Systematics, Inc. (2007)

- FAF3 zones
  - 50 < Avg. speed
  - 40 < Avg. speed ≤ 50
  - 30 < Avg. speed ≤ 40
  - 20 < Avg. speed ≤ 30
  - 10 < Avg. speed ≤ 20
  - 0 < Avg. speed ≤ 10

* Unit of Average speed: mph
**Rail Network Capacity Expansion and Its Effect on Network Assignment**

Congestion prediction from our model in 2035 after capacity expansion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a) Capacity expansion</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
<th>% reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b) Total cost ($10^3$ train-hr/day)</td>
<td>2,025</td>
<td>1,364</td>
<td>32.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Total ton-mile ($10^3$ ton-mile/day)</td>
<td>10,496,597</td>
<td>10,411,213</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Decrease in total ton-miles
  - Less detour toward shipment destinations
  - Improvements in rail freight delivery efficiency

*Unit of Average speed: mph*
Framework

Freight demand and logistics modeling:
Develop and integrate a set of U.S. freight transportation system models to capture interdependencies on future economic growth and urban spatial structure changes

Scope
(i) Inter-regional freight flow; e.g., from Los Angeles to Chicago
(ii) Intra-regional freight flow; e.g., within Chicago metropolitan area
(iii) Point-to-point delivery routing

Global Economic Forecasts Models

Urban Spatial Structure and Input-Output Models

Freight Transportation Systems Models

Air Quality and Climate Impacts Models

Various Economic Factors Projections

Input-Output Commodity Value Forecasts

Employment Distribution within Domestic Regions

Inter-regional Freight Flow

Intra-regional Freight Flow

Regional Level Truck Freight Delivery

Point-to-Point Truck Routing in Urban Freight Delivery

Trip Generation

Trip Distribution

Mode Split

Traffic Assignment

Long-haul Truck and Rail Emission

Short-haul Truck Emission

Air Quality and Climate Impacts in the U.S. Regions

Global Air Quality and Climate Impacts
Introduction

• Bulk of freight arriving at the destinations (i.e., terminals) in each FAZ
  - Broken for delivery to distributed individual customers
  - Also, freight needs to be collected from a large number of supply points to the set of origins (i.e., terminals) in each FAZ

• Freight delivery activities within large urban areas are critical issues
  - Emissions from freight shipments comprise a large share of toxic air pollutants in most metropolitan areas worldwide (OECD, 2003)
  - Residents in metropolitan areas are more likely to be affected by the air pollution problems than those in rural areas

• Need to investigate freight shipment modeling and logistics planning at the intra-regional level
Introduction

- Logistics systems model for freight distribution within an FAZ
  - Vehicles need to serve spatially distributed customer demand which might be large scale (Large-scale Vehicle Routing Problem)
  - Estimate network delivery efficiency

- Methodology: Continuum Approximation (Newell and Daganzo, 1986a)
  (i) Assume continuous customer demand density that may vary slowly over space
  (ii) Suitable for large-scale estimation (asymptotic approximation)

- Objective: Estimate near-optimum total delivery distance

\[
\text{Total travel distance within a delivery region} = \text{Total line-haul distance} + \text{Total local travel distance}
\]
Within FAZ Delivery Procedure

- Application of the ring-sweep algorithm to estimate regional freight delivery

![Diagram] Each FAZ is composed of a set of mutually disjointed census tracts

- Assumptions
  - Freight demand in each census tract is concentrated at the centroid of the census tract
  - Freight demand will be assigned to the nearest terminal (if multiple terminals)
  - Freight is delivered by identical short-haul trucks with constant low speed (e.g. 30 mph)
  - Euclidean metric roadway network

- Objective: Estimate the total transportation cost (i.e., total travel distance)
Within FAZ Delivery

- Total delivery cost to serve freight demand within an FAZ
  = Total line-haul distance ($L_1$) + Total local travel distance ($L_2$)

- “distribution” and “collection”

(1) Total line-haul distance

\[ d_i = \text{distance from the terminal to the centroid of the census tract } i \]
\[ E_{ij} = \text{number of employees in an industry type } j \text{ in the census tract } i \]
\[ I = \text{total number of census tracts} \]
\[ J = \text{total number of industry types considered} \]
\[ C = \text{truck capacity (in tonnage)} \]
\[ D = \text{total freight demand in a given FAZ (tons per day)} \]

\[
\text{Total line-haul distance } (L_1) = \frac{2D\sum_{i=1}^{I} \sum_{j=1}^{J} E_{ij}d_i}{C\sum_{i=1}^{I} \sum_{j=1}^{J} E_{ij}}
\]
Within FAZ Delivery

(2) Total local travel distance

\[ N = \text{total number of demand points in a given FAZ} = \sum_{i=1}^{I} N_i \]

where \( N_i = \text{total number of demand points in each census tract} \)

\[ i = \sum_{j=1}^{J} \frac{E_{ij}}{a_j} \]

\( a_j = \text{average number of employees per firm in an industry type } j \)

- represents how many employees are served on average by one truck visit
- may vary across industries

\( \delta = \text{uniformly distributed demand point density in a given FAZ} \)

where \( A = \text{area of an FAZ} \)

Total local travel distance \( (L_2) = \frac{0.57N}{\sqrt{\delta}} \)
Application

• Estimate regional freight delivery cost and the related emissions (CO$_2$, NO$_X$, PM, and VOC) in 36 FAZs that cover 27 major Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) from 2010 to 2050

• Data
  (i) Forecast of employment distributions (from urban spatial structure model): wholesale trade, retail trade, and manufacturing industries
  (ii) Future truck and rail freight demand for each FAZ (from four-step inter-regional freight demand model)

• Three urban development scenarios
  (i) Scenario 1 “Business as usual”: current urban sprawl continues in the U.S.
  (ii) Scenario 2 “Polycentric development”: CBD (current trend), sub-centers (high-growth)
  (iii) Scenario 3 “Compact development”: both CBD and sub-centers (high-growth)

• Inter-regional freight demand scenario: high GDP growth under business as usual

• Freight collection and distribution deliveries from truck and railroad terminals are modeled separately

• Commodities are delivered separately considering different industry types

• Light and medium trucks: capacity = 4 tons (FHWA U.S. DOT, 2007; Davis et al., 2012), avg. speed = 30 mph
Application

- Regional freight delivery from truck terminals
  A number of truck terminals are located near the junctions of major highways

1. Commodities related to the wholesale and retail trade industries for terminal $k$

$$L_{f1}^k = \frac{2\alpha_1(D_W + D_R)\sum_{i=1}^{I_k} \sum_{j=1}^{2} E_{ij} d_{ki}}{C \sum_{i=1}^{I_k} \sum_{j=1}^{2} E_{ij}}, \quad L_{f2}^k = \frac{0.57 N_f^k}{\sqrt{\delta_f^k}},$$

where $N_f^k = \frac{\alpha_1 \sum_{i=1}^{I_k} \sum_{j=1}^{2} E_{ij}}{a_1}$ and $\delta_f^k = \frac{N_f^k}{A_k}$

2. Commodities related to the manufacturing industry for terminal $k$

$$L_{p1}^k = \frac{2\alpha_2 D_M \sum_{i=1}^{I_k} E_{i3} d_{ki}}{C \sum_{i=1}^{I_k} E_{i3}}, \quad L_{p2}^k = \frac{0.57 N_p^k}{\sqrt{\delta_p^k}},$$

where $N_p^k = \frac{\alpha_2 \sum_{i=1}^{I_k} E_{i3}}{a_2}$ and $\delta_p^k = \frac{N_p^k}{A_k}$

3. Total freight delivery cost in the FAZ summed across all truck terminals $k \in K$

$$G_T = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \left( L_{f1}^k + L_{f2}^k + L_{p1}^k + L_{p2}^k \right)$$
Application

- Regional freight delivery from railroad terminals
  Several railroad terminals are located near the intersections of major railroad links
  1. Commodities for direct shipments from railroad terminals
     - Trucks are not involved in freight delivery
  2. Commodities for short-haul truck delivery from railroad terminals
     (1) Commodities related to the wholesale and retail trade industries for terminal $q$
        \[ L_{s1}^q = \frac{2\beta_1(D_W + D_R)\sum_{i=1}^{I_q}\sum_{j=1}^{2} E_{ij}d_{qi}}{C\sum_{i=1}^{I_q}\sum_{j=1}^{2} E_{ij}}, \quad L_{s2}^q = \frac{0.57N_s^q}{\sqrt{\delta_s^q}}, \text{ where } N_s^q = \frac{\beta_1}{a_1}\sum_{i=1}^{I_q}\sum_{j=1}^{2} E_{ij} \text{ and } \delta_s^q = \frac{N_s^q}{A_q} \]
     (2) Commodities related to the manufacturing industry for terminal $q$
        \[ L_{m1}^q = \frac{2\beta_2D_M\sum_{i=1}^{I_q}E_{i3}d_{qi}}{C\sum_{i=1}^{I_q}E_{i3}}, \quad L_{m2}^q = \frac{0.57N_m^q}{\sqrt{\delta_m^q}}, \text{ where } N_m^q = \frac{\beta_2}{a_2}\sum_{i=1}^{I_q}E_{i3} \text{ and } \delta_m^q = \frac{N_m^q}{A_h}. \]
  3. Total freight delivery cost in the FAZ summed across all railroad terminals $q \in Q$
     \[ G_R = \sum_{q=1}^{Q} \left( L_{s1}^q + L_{s2}^q + L_{m1}^q + L_{m2}^q \right) \]
## Case Study

**Scenarios**

1: Business as usual  
2: Polycentric development  
3: Compact development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,413.69</td>
<td>3,479.54</td>
<td>5,524.88</td>
<td>6,728.67</td>
<td>8,084.86</td>
<td>19.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,316.92</td>
<td>4,059.94</td>
<td>4,966.48</td>
<td>5,992.86</td>
<td>7,134.10</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,284.42</td>
<td>3,898.15</td>
<td>4,748.61</td>
<td>5,701.67</td>
<td>6,753.96</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,660.95</td>
<td>2,028.74</td>
<td>2,439.05</td>
<td>2,935.13</td>
<td>3,498.18</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,600.03</td>
<td>1,919.17</td>
<td>2,294.17</td>
<td>2,741.66</td>
<td>3,243.02</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,592.55</td>
<td>1,903.15</td>
<td>2,275.03</td>
<td>2,718.09</td>
<td>3,215.27</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,145.29</td>
<td>6,344.03</td>
<td>7,633.72</td>
<td>9,096.19</td>
<td>10,737.94</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,391.50</td>
<td>6,234.48</td>
<td>7,478.88</td>
<td>8,887.85</td>
<td>10,474.23</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,423.98</td>
<td>6,556.63</td>
<td>8,100.81</td>
<td>9,865.76</td>
<td>11,926.56</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSA</th>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>CO₂ (10³ kg per day)</th>
<th>NOₓ (kg per day)</th>
<th>PM (kg per day)</th>
<th>VOC (kg per day)</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>2050</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>2050</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>2050</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,223.98</td>
<td>1,880.95</td>
<td>2,898.84</td>
<td>3,413.69</td>
<td>3,479.54</td>
<td>5,524.88</td>
<td>6,728.67</td>
<td>8,084.86</td>
<td>19.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,189.28</td>
<td>1,780.74</td>
<td>2,557.94</td>
<td>3,316.92</td>
<td>4,059.94</td>
<td>4,966.48</td>
<td>5,992.86</td>
<td>7,134.10</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,177.63</td>
<td>1,702.62</td>
<td>2,421.64</td>
<td>3,284.42</td>
<td>3,898.15</td>
<td>4,748.61</td>
<td>5,701.67</td>
<td>6,753.96</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>595.53</td>
<td>874.52</td>
<td>1,254.28</td>
<td>1,660.95</td>
<td>2,028.74</td>
<td>2,439.05</td>
<td>2,935.13</td>
<td>3,498.18</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>573.69</td>
<td>822.58</td>
<td>1,162.79</td>
<td>1,919.17</td>
<td>2,294.17</td>
<td>2,741.66</td>
<td>3,243.02</td>
<td>3,786.58</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>571.01</td>
<td>815.72</td>
<td>1,152.84</td>
<td>1,903.15</td>
<td>2,275.03</td>
<td>2,718.09</td>
<td>3,215.27</td>
<td>3,885.85</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,099.22</td>
<td>3,135.83</td>
<td>4,487.64</td>
<td>2,348.43</td>
<td>34,504.80</td>
<td>49,379.31</td>
<td>64,192.71</td>
<td>7,942.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,941.66</td>
<td>2,737.07</td>
<td>3,850.10</td>
<td>21,364.85</td>
<td>30,117.17</td>
<td>42,364.23</td>
<td>60,667.17</td>
<td>8,102.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,933.13</td>
<td>2,681.56</td>
<td>3,755.55</td>
<td>21,270.98</td>
<td>29,506.29</td>
<td>41,328.31</td>
<td>61,175.67</td>
<td>8,179.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,013.00</td>
<td>3,389.98</td>
<td>5,127.72</td>
<td>2,149.88</td>
<td>37,301.34</td>
<td>56,422.39</td>
<td>71,644.71</td>
<td>9,680.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,944.77</td>
<td>2,904.56</td>
<td>4,276.28</td>
<td>21,399.13</td>
<td>31,960.00</td>
<td>47,035.65</td>
<td>65,315.67</td>
<td>9,720.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,934.22</td>
<td>2,839.80</td>
<td>4,182.73</td>
<td>21,282.97</td>
<td>31,247.50</td>
<td>46,024.25</td>
<td>64,824.58</td>
<td>9,720.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Emission factors (TRL, 1999)*

[illinois.edu](http://illinois.edu)
Framework

Freight demand and logistics modeling:
Develop and integrate a set of U.S. freight transportation system models to capture interdependencies on future economic growth and urban spatial structure changes

Scope
(i) Inter-regional freight flow; e.g., from Los Angeles to Chicago
(ii) Intra-regional freight flow; e.g., within Chicago metropolitan area
(iii) Point-to-point delivery routing

Map showing inter-regional and intra-regional freight flows across the U.S., with particular focus on Chicago and Los Angeles.
Introduction

• Improvements in fleet operations from trucking service sector
  – Reduction in vehicle emissions
  – Huge benefits (urban air quality, human exposure)

• Roadway congestion in large urban areas is stochastic
  – Real time information technology
    Avoid heavy congestion by dynamically choosing the minimum expected cost path
  – Shortest path problem in a stochastic network setting (Miller-Hooks and Mahmassani, 2000; Waller and Ziliaskopoulous, 2002)
    Cost component: travel delay (focus on minimizing the expected total travel time)
Introduction

- Traffic congestion in large urban areas
  - Responsible for air pollution and related human health problems (Copeland, 2011)
- Trucking freight delivery contribute to the largest share of air pollutants in metropolitan areas (ICF Consulting, 2005)
  - Environmental cost caused by truck activities (CO₂, VOC, NOₓ, and PM)
  - Penalties for late or early truck arrival at destination (ensure delivery punctuality)
- “Total” cost = \[ \sum \text{Total delivery time} + \text{Emissions} + \text{Penalty} \]
- Minimum expected travel time solution (classical shortest path approach)
  - Does not necessarily guarantee the minimum expected “total” cost solution
Model Formulation

- Consider urban roadway networks
  Represented by a graph $D(V, A)$ where $V =$ node set and $A =$ directed link set
- From origin to destination, truck driver needs to decide the next link whenever he/she arrives at each node to minimize the expected total cost
- Assumptions
  (i) Truck speed on each link is stochastic (uniquely determined by stochastic congestion state on the link)
  (ii) Truck speed on each link follows a certain probability distribution
    - Fixed throughout the period of routing study (e.g., morning rush hour)
    - Not necessarily identical across the links
  (iii) Consider only major arterial roads or freeways to represent urban network links
    - Queue formed on a link does not spill over into immediate downstream links
    - Congestion states are independent across the links
Model Formulation

origin $g \in V$, destination $s \in V$

$d_{ij} = \text{length of link } (i, j) \in A \text{ (mile)}$

$U_{ij} = \text{stochastic truck speed (mph) on link } (i, j) \in A$

$W(\cdot) = \text{emission rate (g/veh-mile), function of the truck speed } U_{ij}$

$x_{ij} = \text{assignment of vehicle on link } (i, j) \in A$

Minimize $E \left[ \alpha \sum_{(i, j) \in A} \frac{d_{ij}}{U_{ij}} x_{ij} + \beta \sum_{(i, j) \in A} d_{ij} x_{ij} W(U_{ij}) + P \left( \sum_{(i, j) \in A} \frac{d_{ij}}{U_{ij}} x_{ij} \right) \right]$, \quad \text{Minimizes expected total travel cost}

subject to $\sum_{\{j(i, j) \in A\}} x_{ij} - \sum_{\{j'(j, i) \in A\}} x_{ji} = \begin{cases} 
1, & \text{if } i = g, \\
-1, & \text{if } i = s, \\
0, & \text{otherwise,}
\end{cases}$

$x_{ij} \in \{0, 1\}, \quad \forall (i, j) \in A.$

$\alpha ($/hr$), \beta ($/gram$) = \text{parameters to convert units}$

$P(\cdot) = \text{penalty ($)}$ for late or early arrival, function of the total travel time ($T$)

$E = \text{scheduled travel time (hr), shippers’ preference on the total delivery time (given)}$

If $T = E$, no penalty; otherwise, assign penalty
Solution Approaches:
(1) Dynamic Programming

• Stage: each node $i \in V$ in a given network
• State: truck arrival time $m \in [0, \infty)$ at each stage $i \in V$
• Decision: choice from a finite set of decisions on the next link to move onto $\{(i,j) \mid (i,j) \in A\}$
• Truck speed: positive, continuous random variable which follows a certain probability density function
• Algorithm can be written into a recursive Bellman equation with backward induction
• Optimal solution
  Minimum expected total cost of the freight truck from its origin
Solution Approaches:

(2) Deterministic Shortest Path Heuristic

- In many real roadway networks, truck drivers need to select the next travel link in real time (i.e., within several seconds)
- Heuristic to find
  - Feasible solution in a very short computation time even for very large networks
  - Upper bound to the optimum solution
- Shortest path from origin to destination is obtained using the expected link cost considering only link travel time and the related emissions
- Once truck reaches the destination, penalty cost is added
Numerical Examples

- Tested on four examples: small networks and large-scale urban transportation networks

5-node and 13-link network (Powell, 2011)

15-node and 25-link network (Papadimitriou and Steiglitz, 1998)

24-node and 76-link Sioux Falls network (Bar-Gera, 2009)

416-node and 914-link Anaheim network (Bar-Gera, 2009)
Numerical Examples

• Assign a high penalty for late but a low penalty for early arrival

\[ P(T) = \begin{cases} 
100(T - E), & \text{if } T \geq E, \\
-10(T - E), & \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases} \]

where, \( T = \text{total travel time (hr)}, \)
\( E = \text{scheduled travel time (hr)} \)

• Truck emission rate functions (g/veh-mile) for CO₂, VOC, NOₓ, PM (TRL, 1999)

• Parameters that convert weight of emissions and time into monetary values

280 \$/tonCO₂, 200 \$/tonVOC, 200 \$/tonNOₓ, 300 \$/tonPM₁₀ (Muller and Mendelsohn, 2007; Winebrake et al., 2008), 20 \$/hr (Bai et al., 2011)

• Truck speed on each link follows a randomly generated log-normal distribution

mean = uniform [20, 60] (mph), s.d. = uniform [10, 15] (mph)
## Numerical Examples: Computational Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a) Network</th>
<th>(b) Algorithm</th>
<th>(c) Min. expected total cost ($)</th>
<th>(d) Gap (%)</th>
<th>(e) Solution time (sec)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-node and 7-link network</td>
<td>Shortest path heuristic</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dynamic programming</td>
<td>32.51</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>($D = 0.025$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-node and 25-link network</td>
<td>Shortest path heuristic</td>
<td>20.49</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dynamic programming</td>
<td>19.97</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>($D = 0.030$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-node and 76-link Sioux Falls network</td>
<td>Shortest path heuristic</td>
<td>49.55</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dynamic programming</td>
<td>48.19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>160.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>($D = 0.050$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416-node and 914-link Anaheim network</td>
<td>Shortest path heuristic</td>
<td>132.60</td>
<td>21.02</td>
<td>0.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dynamic programming</td>
<td>109.57</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,741.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>($D = 0.040$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Numerical Examples: Computational Results

- **Benchmark routing** = Ignoring emission cost in selecting the route
- **Proposed routing** = Considering emission cost in selecting the route
- **Cost difference** = Cost from the benchmark routing - Cost from the proposed routing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a) Network</th>
<th>(b) Scenario</th>
<th>(c) Min. expected total cost ($)</th>
<th>(d) Travel time ($)</th>
<th>(e) Emissions ($)</th>
<th>(f) Penalty ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-node and 7-link network</td>
<td>Benchmark design</td>
<td>35.45</td>
<td>13.88</td>
<td>13.76</td>
<td>7.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed approach</td>
<td>32.51</td>
<td>14.39</td>
<td>10.81</td>
<td>7.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost difference</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>-0.51</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% change</td>
<td>8.29%</td>
<td>-3.67%</td>
<td>21.42%</td>
<td>6.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-node and 25-link network</td>
<td>Benchmark design</td>
<td>21.22</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>8.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed approach</td>
<td>19.97</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>8.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost difference</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% change</td>
<td>5.87%</td>
<td>-5.97%</td>
<td>24.38%</td>
<td>2.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-node and 76-link Sioux Falls network</td>
<td>Benchmark design</td>
<td>52.75</td>
<td>24.57</td>
<td>15.57</td>
<td>12.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed approach</td>
<td>48.19</td>
<td>14.52</td>
<td>9.22</td>
<td>24.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost difference</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>10.05</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>-11.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% change</td>
<td>8.64%</td>
<td>40.90%</td>
<td>40.82%</td>
<td>-93.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416-node and 914-link Anaheim network</td>
<td>Benchmark design</td>
<td>114.38</td>
<td>67.00</td>
<td>47.00</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed approach</td>
<td>109.57</td>
<td>67.29</td>
<td>41.81</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost difference</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% change</td>
<td>4.21%</td>
<td>-0.44%</td>
<td>11.04%</td>
<td>-21.76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SPEW-Trend fleet model

Represent how emissions are affected by technology change and modal choice
Climate policy (carbon tax) causes modal shift to railway—BUT not “enough” (Commodity-limited)
Fuel use projection

MDH fuel consumption trend

- No congestion (by tonne-km only)
- With projected eff. improvement*
- With congestion
- Previous
- GCAM (input-output)

(*) regression!
Emission projection – air pollutants
(congestion case)
Conclusions

• Environmental problems from freight shipment activities
  – Climate change (on global scale)
  – Air quality and human health (in regional and urban areas)
• Choice of freight mode and routing them between/within geographical regions significantly affect regional and urban air quality
• Freight demand models are developed to reflect dependences on future economic growth and urban spatial changes
• Scope of the freight transportation
  – Inter-regional freight flow: Four-step freight demand forecasting model
  – Intra-regional freight flow: Various network optimization models and solution approaches
Contributions

- In this interdisciplinary project, we
  - Develop a comprehensive freight shipment modeling framework ranging from initial collecting systems, to freight movements and routing at the national scale, and then to final distributing systems
  - Provide deeper understanding of the interdependencies and connections among multiple traditionally separated research fields
  - Aid decision-makers in evaluating freight handling decisions that contribute to reducing adverse impacts on air quality and climate change
  - Facilitate decision-making processes in the freight industries or the government agencies by providing an integrated decision-support software
  - Extend and apply to other studies such as transportation network capacity expansion and maintenance as well as traffic safety prediction
  - Enhance human health and social welfare
Future Research

(1) Trip generation and trip distribution
   • “Distribution of future freight demand is proportional to that of the base-year freight demand” can be relaxed
     → Gravity model for freight demand distribution
   • Once newer version of FAF database becomes available
     → More recent base-year to improve forecast accuracy

(2) Modal split
   • Update the models using additional/newer version freight demand data
     → Estimation of precise environmental impacts of freight transportation systems
Future Research

(3) Network assignment

• Impacts of infrastructure investment in the rail network on modal split
  → Enhanced level of service and its effect on future rail freight demand (i.e.,
    against other modes in a competitive freight shipment market)

(4) Stochastic urban freight truck routing problem

• Apply time-dependent stochastic congestion state on each link
  → Link travel time and following emissions will be affected by stochastic
    truck speed as well as truck arrival time at the link origin node

• Include local and collector roads in the urban transportation networks
  → Truck speed on downstream and upstream links may be correlated

• Apply environmental impacts from transportation activities to other stochastic
  network optimization problems
Thank you!

Any questions?
Background

- **Freight Analysis Zone (FAZ)**
  - Defined in Freight Analysis Framework to represent the U.S. geographical regions with regard to freight activities
  - Composed of 123 domestic regions in total
    - 74 metropolitan areas
    - 33 regions representing the remaining parts of the states that these 74 metropolitan areas belong to
    - 16 remaining regions, each of which represents an entire state
- Map of domestic FAZs in Freight Analysis Framework version 3
## 10 Commodity Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commodity type</th>
<th>Commodity description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture products and fish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grain, alcohol, and tobacco products</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stones, nonmetallic minerals, and metallic ores</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal and petroleum products</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic chemicals, chemical and pharmaceutical products</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logs, wood products, and textile and leather</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base metal and machinery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic, motorized vehicles, and precision instruments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture, mixed freight, and miscellaneous manufactured products</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commodity unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>